

REMARKS

After entering the above amendments, claims 1-19 and 22 will be pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the current application are requested in light of the above-marked amendments and the foregoing remarks.

Summary of Rejections. The Office has rejected claims 1-14 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being drawn to non-statutory subject matter; claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0167315 to Chowdhry (hereinafter “Chowdhry”); claims 1, 4-11, and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentably obvious over Chowdhry in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0047394 to Kloba (hereinafter “Kloba”); and claims 2-3, 12-13 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentably obvious over Chowdhry in view of Kloba, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0066031, to Laane (hereinafter “Laane”).

Summary of Amendments. With this amendment, claims 1, 10, 11 and 22 have been amended. The amendments are fully supported by the original specification.

Rejections under 35 USC §101

Claims 1-14 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101, because the Office alleges that the claims are drawn to unpatentable subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 10, 11 and 22 have been amended to recite that the processors implementing certain features and functions of the claimed invention are computer processors. Thus, these claims, and their dependent claims, are now directed to the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine (a special purpose computer) and therefore are proper statutory subject matter.

For at least these reasons, withdrawal of the pending rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 USC §102

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Chowdhry. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

To present a valid anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102, the Office must identify a single prior art reference in which “each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described.” MPEP §2131 quoting *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The rejection over Chowdhry fails to satisfy this burden with regards to the currently pending claims.

Chowdhry fails to teach or suggest a number of claimed features of claim 22. First, Chowdhry fails to disclose recited limitations of “the a server-controller implemented on the one or more computer processors modifying a model of an application component on a server as a response to the modification-request.” In fact, in its entirety, Chowdhry does not mention or even suggest a model. The cited passage of Chowdhry alleged to teach these limitations is reproduced below:

“Another unique feature of the user interface is the ability for the user interface to refresh each portlet independently of the others. Upon creation, each portlet is assigned a refresh rate by the portlet creator.” Chowdhry, para. [0243], lines 1-3.

Thus, it is apparent that portlets are refreshed independently of each other, and on a regular basis based on a refresh rate. This refresh as taught by Chowdhry is not performed as a response to a modification-request, as claimed.

Chowdhry also fails to teach or suggest “a server-renderer implemented on the one or more computer processors generating at least one browser-increment after the model has been

modified.” Chowdhry discloses that portlets are updated by writing over the original contents of all portlets that need to be updated with updated content (para [0222]). In the present invention, application components are modified by modifying a model of the application component, and then generating at least one browser-increment after the model has been modified. Only then, in the present invention, is an instance of a browser component updated, which is a feature most like Chowdhry’s content-providing portlet.

Thus, Chowdhry does not teach or suggest a model, and does not teach or suggest updating a browser component by modifying a model of an application component corresponding to the browser component. Accordingly, Chowdhry fails to anticipate claim 22.

For at least these reasons, withdrawal of the pending rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 USC §103

Claims 1, 4-11, and 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentably obvious over Chowdhry in view of Kloba. Claims 2-3, 12-13 and 17-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentably obvious over Chowdhry in view of Kloba, and further in view of Laane. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Office “bears the initial burden of factually supporting any *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness” and must therefore present “a clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious.” MPEP §2142. An obviousness rejection “cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.” MPEP §2141 quoting *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 82 USPQ2d 1386, 1385 (2007). This rationale must include a showing that all of the claimed elements were known in the

prior art and that one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, to produce a combination yielding nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art. *KSR*, 82 USPQ2d at 1395. MPEP §2141.02 further notes that "a prior art reference must be considered in its entirety, i.e., as a whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention. *W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984). The rejections fail to satisfy this burden with regards to the currently pending claims.

As described above, Chowdhry fails to teach or suggest a number of recited features, particularly of independent claims 1, 10, 11, 15 and 16. For example, Chowdhry fails to teach or suggest a model or an original model. Chowdhry also fails to disclose updating an original document object model component of a browser component by modifying the original model of an application component corresponding to the browser component.

The acknowledged fact that Chowdhry does not explicitly state a document object model (DOM) component has very little relevance in the face of Chowdhry's numerous other limitations and omissions. Therefore, claims 1, 10, 11, 15 and 16 are not obvious from Chowdhry combined in any fashion with the other cited references. Claims 2-9, 12-14, and 17-19 are allowable at least for their dependence on an allowable base claim.


For at least these reasons, withdrawal of the pending rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the foregoing amendments, the pending claims are in condition for allowance. It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the additional claim fee and any additional fees that may be due, or credit any overpayment of same, to Deposit Account No. 50-0311, Reference No. 34874-135/202P00117WOU. If there are any questions regarding this reply, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



James P. Cleary
Reg. No. 45,843

Date: February 16, 2010

Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.
3580 Carmel Mountain Road
Suite 300
San Diego, CA 92130
Customer No.: 64280
Tel.: 858/314-1533
Fax: 858/314-1501
jpcleary@mintz.com